

Reconsideration
10/771,599

5000-1-516

REMARKS

Reconsideration of all grounds of rejection in the Office Action and allowance of all of the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 are rejected. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 11 are independent claims. New dependent claims 12-14 have been added. Claims 1-14 are pending.

Dependent claims 12-14 have been added. Supports for these new dependent claims are found in the specification on page 19, (paragraph 0064) of the disclosure. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-11 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's PRIOR ART, FIG. 2 in view of Ota (US 5,282,257).

Claims 1 and 8, as currently presented, recite a high-speed WPAN (Wireless Personal Area Network) system, comprising, *inter alia*, a PNC (Pico-Net Coordinator) device for managing the devices, wherein one of the PNC devices provided in the plurality of pico-nets allocates and manages timeslots for all of the devices located in the plurality of pico-nets.

Similarly, Claim 9 and 11, as currently presented, recite methods providing the same

In the instant Office Action, it is asserted that the combination of applicant's own prior art described in the background of invention section of the specification and FIG. 2 along with Ota's 3-terminal inter-connectable star coupler illustrated in Ota's FIG. 2 render base claims 1 and 8 obvious. In particular, the Office Action asserts that, "[i]n regard to the last 2 lines of claim 1 and 7, see paragraph 20 of the applicant's specification which teaches that one of the PNCs can control the allocation of time slots in other Pico-nets." The Office Action finds that it would have been obvious based upon this disclosure to "have one PNC in charge of time allocation in Pico nets that communicate with each other in order to avoid collisions.

Reconsideration
10/771,599

5000-1-516

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has misread or misinterpreted paragraph 20 and that paragraph 20 is being read out of context of the full explanation provided in the background of the invention of the instant application, as explained hereinafter.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review paragraph 20 with reference to FIG. 1 and additionally compare FIG. 2 and 4 by reading further to paragraph 27 of the specification.

Reading paragraph 20 of the instant application in context reveals that the applicants' are merely explaining the prior art by referencing FIG. 1 to explain the Bluetooth specification which provides that *pico-nets* are formed between a single PNC and that the devices forming the pico-net are classified as independent pico-net or dependent pico-net as illustrated in FIG. 1. Paragraph 21 then explains that the communications between devices located in different pico-nets require a MAC bridge. Then paragraph 24 explains the 'path setup function' provided by a central entity 20 as illustrated in FIG. 2, paragraph 26 explains that transmissions of data between a plurality of devices is on the basis of timeslots allocated by various PNC devices and finally paragraph 27 explains that the MAC bridge function is contained in the central entity 20 to manage all the devices in various pico-nets. In contrast, as can be seen in FIG. 4, the present invention does not include a central entity and does not add a MAC bridge function (see paragraph 64) and therefore a single PNC, provided in the plurality of pico-nets allocates and manages timeslots for all of the devices located in the plurality of pico-nets as recited in the base claims.

Therefore, as explained above, neither the prior art or Ota, which does not relate to high-speed WPAN, fails to teach or suggest a high-speed WPAN (Wireless Personal Area Network) system, comprising, or method of providing same, *inter alia*, a PNC (Pico-Net Coordinator)

Reconsideration
10/771,599

5000-1-516

device for managing the devices, wherein one of the PNC devices provided in the plurality of pico-nets allocates and manages timeslots for all of the devices located in the plurality of pico-nets, as recited in the base claims.

Moreover, there is no suggest to combine Ota with applicant's own prior art other than the Office Action's impermissible hindsight using applicant's own application as a blueprinting and filling in the gaps with unrelated references. In fact combining the application's own prior art with Ota would not result in the instant application as recited in all four base claims because changes would have to be made in the MAC layer and a bridge function would have to be added (Paragraph 0064, page 19, line 10). The Federal Circuit has stated that the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention and the reasonable expectation of success both must be found in the prior art, not in Applicant's disclosure. See In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); Rockwell Int'l Corp. v. United States, 147 F.3d 1358, 47 USPQ 2d 1027, 1033(Fed. Cir. 1998). The Office Action's suggested motivation is drawn directly from applicants own background of invention not Ota which does not even mention pico nets or PNCs and moreover does not result in no changes to the MAC layer and a bridge function would have to be added to Ota.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claim discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration
10/771,599

5000-1-516

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims are patentable in view of the cited reference. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Cha
Registration No. 44,069


By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Date: 4/16/07

Mail all correspondence to:

Cha & Reiter, LLC
210 Route 4 East, #103
Paramus, NJ 07652
Tel: 201-226-9245
Fax: 201-226-9246